Notice of Allowability	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/692,507	ABBOTT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tadesse Hailu	2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☐ This communication is responsive to *11/5/2004*.

2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are *1-7,9-61,73,76,77,80,82-89,92,93,124-127 and 131-220*.

3. ☒ The drawings filed on *19 October 2000* are accepted by the Examiner.

4. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

  a)☐ All   b)☐ Some*   c)☐ None   of the:
   1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .
   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the
      International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

  * Certified copies not received: _____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.
THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

5. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.

6. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
  (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
    1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date _____.
  (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of
    Paper No./Mail Date _____.

  Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).

7. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)
1. ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2. ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3. ☒ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08), Paper No./Mail Date 8
4. ☐ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material

5. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6. ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413), Paper No./Mail Date _____ .
7. ☐ Examiner's Amendment/Comment
8. ☐ Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance
9. ☐ Other _____.

RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is in response to the Supplemental Response
submitted/entered on 11/5/2004.

Allowable Subject Matter

2.   Claims 1-7, 9-61, 73, 76-77, 80, 82-89, 124-127, and 131-220 are allowed.
The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The examiner has carefully considered the pending claims 1-7, 9-61, 73, 76-77,
80, 82-89, 124-127, and 131-220. The present invention is a method, apparatus and
computer readable medium for exchanging context attributes. A characterization
module receives an invocation request to provide an attribute value that was generated
by a requesting attribute consumer. The received invocation request identifies the
attribute whose value is to be provided. In response to receiving the invocation request,
the characterization module provides a value for the identified attribute to the requesting
attribute consumer. The claims are also directed to exchanging context attributes.

The prior art of record fails to teach a method in a computing device for
exchanging context attributes including the combination of claim elements at least in
part "the invocation request further specifying a basis for determining one of a plurality
of values of the identified attributes that are available from different source to provide
such that a newest available value of the identified attribute is to be selected;" as
specified in independent **claim 1**. Independent **claim 50** also recites similar limitations
in computing device form.

The prior art of record fails to teach a method in a computing device for exchanging context attributes including the combination of claim elements at least in part "determining whether the age of the previously-obtained value of the identified attribute exceeds a specified maximum age;" and "if the age of the previously-obtained value of the identified attribute does not exceed the specified maximum age, providing the previously-obtained value of the identified attribute to the requesting attribute consumer;" as specified in independent **claim 24**. Independent **claims 55 and 219** also recite similar limitations in computing device form. Independent **claim 217** also recites similar limitations in storage form.

The prior art of record fails to teach a method in a computing device for exchanging context attributes including the combination of claim elements at least in part "the invocation request further specifying ... the available value of the identified attribute having a lowest uncertainty level is to be selected;" as specified in independent **calm 39**.

The prior art of record fails to teach a method in a computing device for exchanging context attributes including the combination of claim elements at least in part "the invocation request further specifying ... an average of a plurality of values of the identified attribute that are available from different sources;" as specified in claim independent claim 40. Independent **claim 61** also recites similar limitations in storage form.

The prior art of record fails to teach a method in a computing device for exchanging context attributes including the combination of claim elements at least in

part "the invocation request further specifying a basis for determining a value of the identified attribute to provide based at least in part on uncertainty level;" as specified in independent **claim 41**.

The prior art of record fails to teach a method in a computing device for exchanging context attributes including the combination of claim elements at least in part "the invocation request further specifying a basis for determining a value of the identified attribute to provide based at least in part on age;" as specified in independent **claim 42**.

The prior art of record fails to teach a method in a computing device for exchanging context attributes including the combination of claim elements at least in part "the invocation request further specifying...the available value of the identified attribute that occurs the largest number of times among the available values of the identified attribute is to be selected;" as specified in independent **claim 43**.

The prior art of record fails to teach a method in a computing device for exchanging context attributes including the combination of claim elements at least in part "in response to invocation ... the time at which the value of the attribute is most accurate." as specified in independent **claim 73**. Independent **claim 89** also recites similar limitations in storage form.

The prior art of record fails to teach a method in a computing device for exchanging context attributes including the combination of claim elements at least in part "invoking the attribute source... an indication of a maximum time in which the attribute source is expected to supply the identified attribute." as specified in **claim 77**.

The prior art of record fails to teach a method in a computing device for exchanging context attributes including the combination of claim elements at least in part " in response to invocation... to receive a value of the attribute and an indication of units in which the value of the attribute is expressed." as specified in independent **claim 82.**

The prior art of record fails to teach a method in a computing device for exchanging context attributes including the combination of claim elements at least in part " In response to invocation...to receive a value of the attribute and an indication of a format in which the value of the attribute is expressed." as specified in independent **claim 83.**

Thus, prior art neither renders obvious nor anticipates the combination of claimed elements in light of the specification.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

CONCLUSION

3.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Tadesse Hailu, whose telephone number is (571) 273-4051. The Examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 10:00 - 630 ET. If attempts

to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, John

Cabeca, can be reached at (571) 273-4048 Art Unit 2173.

4.　　Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is

(703) 305-3900.

Tadesse Hailu
November 12, 2004

RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173